

Examiner: VALENTI, ANDREA M
Group A.U.: 3643
December 23, 2003

Remarks.

Reconsideration of the application as hereby amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's new comments and objections and the cited references have been carefully considered by the Applicant.

It is firstly noted that now the Examiner deems allowable claims 18-20, 23 and 25-26.

It is submitted that claim 18 includes limitations independent from the limitations of intervening claims 15 and 17, and as such its subject-matter combines directly with that of independent claim 14.

For cost savings and procedural expedience claims 27 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claim 14 has been amended by addition thereto of the limitations of claim 23.

New independent claims 29 and 30 have been also added that are include the limitations of claim 14 and further additional features as follows.

New claim 29 additionally includes the features of claim 18.

New claim 30 includes in line 3 the limitation set forth in italic, bold letters and not present in claim 14: "*...at least three taangs ...and along three mutually perpendicular axes...*".

Such limitation, introduced in agreement with the Examiner's suggestion (to more clearly define the structural elements of the profile..., in the par. *Response to Arguments*) clearly differentiate the definition of the corner joints over both Daily and Ho.

Daily teaches a corner joint in which "the body 28" is in fact formed by two aligned arms and **only one third arm perpendicular thereto** (see figure 6 and column 4, lines 16-20).

USSN: 09880144

Examiner: VALENTI, ANDREA M

Group A.U.: 3643

December 23, 2003

As regards the a possible combination of the seats 31,3 of Ho with the structure of Daily, it is submitted that such combination is not obvious for the following facts.

1. The basic reference teaches away from the invention

Daily teaches that his structure in which the walls are directly connected into the corner pieces without additional seats for the grilles "*eliminates projections which could injure..*" (column 1, lines 42-47).

Additional sets, as in Ho provide protrusion of the inner lips of the additional seat. Furthermore, profiles separately connectable and additional grilles to be separately connected into additional seats do not represent a simplified, easier to assemble or disassemble version of Daily's cage for the skilled person, but quite the contrary.

Hence,

2. There is a lack of suggestion in the cited prior art of the desirability of modifying the basic reference or combining the references.

It is eventually submitted that claim 26 comprises limitations drawn to the possibility to assemble more cages to form modules which is neither taught nor suggested by Daily or Ho, as the Examiner appears to suggest at page 5 second paragraph of the Office Action.

It will be noted that a sincere effort has been made to positively respond to all of the points raised by the Examiner.

While it is believed that the amended claims properly and clearly define the present invention, applicant would welcome, also for procedural convenience, an Examiner's amendment which more accurately may define the present invention.

088/60 NSS
144

Examiner: VALENTI, ANDREA M
Group A.U.: 3643
December 23, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Guido MODIANO (Reg. No. 19,928)

Agent for the Applicant

Via Meravigli 16

20123 MILAN-ITALY

Tel.: +39.02.86 92 442

Fax.: +39.02-863-860

Milan: December 23, 2003